

## **REMARKS**

Claims 32-35 and 37-42 were presented for examination. Claims 41 and 42 have been allowed, while claims 32-35 and 37-40 stand rejected. Applicant hereby seeks to amend claim 32. Reconsideration of this application as amended, and allowance of all claims herein, claims 32-35 and 37-42 as amended, are hereby respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner should enter the offered amendment, because the amendment adopts an Examiner suggestion and complies with a requirement of form set forth in his final Office Action. Furthermore, the amendment places the case in condition for allowance. 37 CFR §1.116; MPEP 714.12, 714.13.

In his first paragraph, the Examiner stated: "This Action is in response to applicant's correspondence of 2 February 2004." It is assumed that the Examiner meant to say instead that the Action was in response to Applicant's Amendment D mailed to the USPTO on May 21, 2004.

In his fifth paragraph, the Examiner stated that a copy of a Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review was enclosed with the final Office Action. There was no Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review enclosed with the final Office Action. Applicant assumes that the formal drawings that were filed with the USPTO on March 1, 2004 are acceptable to the USPTO, and if not, the Examiner is requested to so state.

In the unnumbered paragraph after his fifth paragraph, the Examiner rejected claims 32-35 and 37-40 under 35 U.S.C. §101 "because they contain no mention of a storage medium on which for example copy right mask are contain or a computer or processor on which the method which is recited is disclosed."

In response to this rejection, Applicant hereby seeks to amend claim 32 to state that the content override mask is generated "using an electronic computing device." The Examiner is requested to enter this amendment, because it adopts an Examiner suggestion, complies with a requirement of form, and places the case in condition for allowance.


Claims 33-35 and 37-40 are dependent claims depending upon independent claim 32.

For the above reasons, the Examiner is requested to withdraw his rejection of claims 32-35 and 37-40, and to allow these claims as amended.

In his sixth paragraph, the Examiner indicated that claims 41 and 42 are allowed.

Applicant believes that this application is in condition for allowance of all claims herein, claims 32-35 and 37-42 as amended, and therefore an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees or believes that, for any other reason, direct contact with Applicant's attorney would help advance the prosecution of this case to finality, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward J. Radlo  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 26,793

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, IL 60606-1080  
Tel.: (415)882-2402

cc: P. Kocher